

# **Reflecting on reflections: the spoken word as a professional development tool in language teacher education**

## **1. Introduction**

The struggle for English Language Teaching (ELT), and by default language teacher education (LTE), to become recognized as fully-fledged professions is a continuing one (Wallace, 1991, pp. 4-6). However, increased professionalism in LTE has contributed greatly to its quest for independent disciplinary status in recent years. Some of these professional practices have occurred as a result of emerging philosophies, others because of empirical findings, and others still due to technical advances. The present chapter firstly provides an up-to-date profile and contextualisation of LTE. This includes brief discussions of theoretical and practical issues such as reflective practice, action research, critical approaches, the role of language and genre, and participation in language teaching communities of practice (Wenger, 1998). It then examines in detail how a spoken language corpus is vital for the successful critical reflection on one component of LTE programmes; teaching practice reviews, one of the most crucial aspects of what we do on teacher education programmes. As part of this discussion it will consider the part that computerized spoken language corpora can play in supporting and advancing some of the emerging paradigms. The focus is on the use of spoken corpora for professional development and introspection for those attending and conducting LTE programmes. The aim is to furnish detail on the nature of linguistic interactions in this specific arena in the belief that such deliberations are an integral part of the continuous professional development of LTE. Analytical linguistic examples, where provided, are based on a spoken language corpus of approximately 80,000

words, consisting of dyadic interactions between university-based ELT trainers and trainees discussing teaching practice (hereafter, the POTTI corpus).

## **2. Reflective practice and action research**

Traditionally, up until the 1960s and 1970s, the predominant educational research framework was ‘process-product’ (Fang, 1996, p. 48, Freeman and Johnson, 1998, p. 399) and this was very much in line with behavioural philosophies of learning at that time. Research sought to describe the effects of teachers’ actions (behaviours) on what students produced. ‘In this basic paradigm, teachers’ thoughts motivated their actions, which triggered students’ thoughts, which motivated students’ actions’ (Freeman, 1996, p. 736). There was a disparity between the researcher and the classroom. Researchers assumed the role of the ‘outside observer looking in’ (Widdowson, 1993, p. 263). This role isolation overlooked the social and contextual complexities involved and researchers who were aloof and lacking in insider perspectives were responsible for creating ‘an abstract, decontextualized body of knowledge that denies the complexities of human interaction and reduces teaching to a quantifiable set of behaviours’ (Freeman and Johnson, 1998, p. 399 citing Smyth 1987). Consequently, LTE operated from a ‘technical rationalist’ perspective (Boote, 2001, Carter and Doyle, 1996, Crookes, 1997, Korthagen and Russell, 1995), which assumes that teachers need discrete amounts of predetermined knowledge in terms of subject content and delivery skills in order to develop effective teaching behaviours (Day, 1991, p. 38, Golombek, 1998, p. 447, Wideen, Mayer-Smith and Moon, 1998, p. 160). Language teacher educators taking this approach necessarily employ retrospective practices to transmit what teachers need to know and how they can be trained, versus what they already know and how this shapes their practice (Freeman and Johnson, 1998p. 398).

With the advent of cognitive psychology (Fang, 1996, p. 48) and the much-cited publication of 'Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study' (Lortie, 1975) came a move in research to examining teachers' views and cognitions of their teaching and practices as they themselves interpret and represent them. A new body of research emerged describing teachers' thoughts, judgements and decisions as the cognitive processes that determined their behaviour (Freeman, 1996, Freeman and Johnson, 1998). Initially the focus of such research lay in uncovering the conceptual models of teacher thinking so that it could be used as a knowledge base in LTE (for example, Shavelson and Stern, 1981), using almost exclusively hermeneutically-oriented methodologies. Teachers were seen as mere informants and the researcher's job was to interpret and analyse the elicited language data. For various reasons, soon there was a move towards an examination of teachers' personal practical knowledge, using a variety of complementary data gathering tools and techniques. Therefore, since the 1990s, while the source of investigation has not necessarily changed (the teacher and the context of teaching), the method of investigation has altered considerably. We now have more co-construction and interpretation of teacher narratives with the teacher often being the primary investigator within a participant-researcher or action research framework, and we also have data emanating from a multiplicity of sources such as journals, classroom observations, questionnaires etc. An extensive discussion of this type of research is not feasible in this chapter but good examples and reviews can be found in Byrnes, 2000, Carter and Doyle, 1996, Freeman, 2001b, Freeman and Johnson, 1998, Kramsch, 2000, Lantolf, 2000, Lantolf, 2001.

Findings from this type of research dictate that instead of using received or scientific knowledge as the primary focus in LTE programmes we should start with teachers' existing schema and experiential knowledge, practical and informal theories (Wallace, 1991, Chapter 1, Kinginger, 1997, p. 7) and bring this to the level of conscious awareness by fostering practices of reflection which can help them to 'contextualise their personal practical knowledge' (Golombek, 1998, p. 461). Such an awareness can then lead to appropriate development and relevant change or innovation in practice (Kennedy, 1997, Kramsch, 1998, Pennington, 1995, Schön, 1983, p. 7). It has been suggested that giving trainees a 'voice' (Elbaz, 1991, p. 10) validates their experiences (Kinging, 1997, p. 8), recognizes them as persons with knowledge and cognition (Elbaz, 1981, p. 45), gives a feeling of ownership and individuality (VanPatten, 1997, p. 4), and provides a tool for continued professional development which should be the aim of teacher education courses if we accept their limitations in terms of immediate impact. More fundamental, however, is the thesis that teaching experience and practice (apprenticeship) does not promote efficiency without the added dimension of reflection to allow for the appropriation of theory to real teaching situations (Oxford, 1997, p. 47). The integration of reflective activities has become central in many LTE programmes with many training materials available (see for example Tanner and Green, 1998) and some have even developed models for assessing the quantity and quality of reflection among trainees (Johnson, 1996, Bax and Cullen, 2003). Such reflection can also effectively be focused in the paradigm of action research with teachers as researchers or joint collaborators involved in the processes of building appropriate theory and teaching development strategy (Widdowson, 1993, p. 262, see also Breen, 1989, Burns, 1996, Crookes, 1997, Edge and Richards, 1998, Lieberman, 1986) and links the worlds of personal practical knowledge and empirical knowledge in a more holistic sense

(Golombek, 1998, p. 461). Beyer, (1991) on a cautionary note, suggests that ‘a careful analysis of reflection – one that helps us understand the nature, aim and process of the activities associated with a particular view of reflection – is needed if this alternative to technical training is to be viable’ (p. 114). In many ways the type of research which the present chapter reports on the POTTI context is exactly this, an analysis of how we conduct reflection. Of course, the place and integrity of theoretical knowledge is not denied by the refocus suggested for LTE. Instead, the ‘important elements of the future of educational practice and theory lie in the development of praxis, the theorized practice of specific situations’ (Edge and Richards, 1998, p. 574), in a more bottom up, reflective, research-based paradigm with the teacher and teaching context at the centre in a more holistic model which integrates received and experiential knowledge (see Wallace, 1991, p. 15 for a diagrammatic representation of his reflective model for LTE).

### **3. The reflective practices of language teacher educators**

There is an added dimension to the implementation of reflective practices, which I alluded to briefly in the previous section. In view of the fact that trainee learning can take place from what educators say and what they do we need to be careful of ‘inconsistencies between our message and our example’ (Gore, 1991, p. 253). In the same publication, Gore distinguishes between the pedagogy we talk about (what we teach) and the pedagogy of our talk (how we teach) and how the former has had much attention to the detriment of the latter in LTE, despite both being important in the production of teachers. If we are to expect trainees to place value on and show enthusiasm for ideas and activities then we should demonstrate our commitment to them by practising them and by doing all that we ask our students to do. This means a

commitment to critical reflection running through the entire LTE programme (Beyer, 1991, p. 120, Korthagen and Russell, 1995, p. 187). Edge and Richards, (1998, p. 574), suggest that if we can't find time to practise what we preach, even in the face of the many demands on our time, then it is difficult to justify our position as educators of future teachers as we ourselves are at risk of becoming aloof and isolated (Duff, 1988, p. 111, Rossner, 1988, p. 108). There is also the inherent societal role of teacher trainers as 'potential *agents of change* in the creation of "learning" teachers' (Kennedy, 1997, p. 129, italics added), one which demands that we also assume the role of a learning trainer. In addition, any such neglect would mean that we continue to acquire our professional knowledge 'through unsupported processes of trial and error, and intuition' (Bailey, Hawkins, Irujo, Larsen-Freeman, Rintell and Willett, 1998, p. 537), in the absence of formalised trainers' training courses. It has been cautioned that such example and integration at all levels is vital if 'reflective teaching is to avoid becoming simply another in a long line of slogans within educational theory and practice' (Beyer, 1991, p. 128). It has been suggested that this paradigm is vital to avoid the mistake of operating a 'Do as I say, not as I do' regimes which advocate progressive practices within their own traditional structures. After all, how can we expect trainee teachers to challenge models which we may be conforming to?

#### **4. The emerging role of teacher educators**

Findings from the lenses of cognitive and personal practical knowledge research, coupled with social constructivist educational philosophies have led many to question the traditional norms of teacher education (Boote, 2003, p. 257, see also Wideen, Mayer-Smith and Moon, 1998). If it is even partially true that we teach the way we were taught rather than the way we are taught to teach, then one might conclude that we

are bound to perpetuate the models we have been exposed to in our learning histories. It has been suggested that in order to begin breaking the cycle we can ‘bring our past experience to the level of conscious awareness’ (Bailey, Bergthold, Braunstein, Jagodzinski-Fleischman, Holbrook, Tuman, Waissbluth and Zambo, 1996, p. 11), through reflective practice and research techniques as discussed above. Therefore, learning to teach is no longer just about obtaining credentials and acquiring skills but about ‘transforming an identity, adapting personal understandings and ideals to institutional realities, and deciding how to express one’s self in classroom activity’ (Carter and Doyle, 1996, p. 139). This refocus necessarily creates an emerging role for teacher educators as facilitators in the process of moulding and changing the beliefs and attitudes of trainees in using autonomous and collective procedures. Gore, (1991, p. 260) indicates the paramount role of interpersonal relationships between trainer and trainee in a TP context and the time needed to nurture this (see also Mann, 2003). Pennington, (1995) in her examination of teacher change refers to teachers’ cognitive-affective filters as determined by their personal experiences and philosophies decide how much innovation is converted into intake allowing for continual development in teaching practices. In fact, it seems that all arrows are pointing towards the internal worlds of teachers, both cognitively and affectively, being the appropriate focus for LTE. One of the resultant roles of teacher educators would seem to be akin to that of

...belief and attitude therapists. That is, they see themselves primarily working with beginning teachers’ existing beliefs and attitudes. This new role is quite a departure from their more traditional roles: expert pedagogues who teach teaching skills, educational researchers who teach educational knowledge, or critics of dominant schooling practices. (Boote, 2003, p. 258)

In this and an earlier publication (2001), Boote suggests that there are many overlooked issues in relation to this newfound role such as ethical concerns and questions of appropriate competence to handle the type of invasive interventions required, both of which beg for further reflexive consideration and research. And at the heart of his discussions in both papers is what he calls the ‘dilemma’ (2001) or ‘double-bind’ (2003) inherent and irresolvable in this role. He claims that the aims of achieving meritorious belief change in a way that fits with the teacher educators’ social and educational goals to improve the school system as *they* see fit is incompatible with the newly attested aim of enabling professional autonomy. In other words, it is impossible to be both facilitators of professional development and gate-keepers to the profession. Nonetheless, many of the models promoted for use in LTE, especially in the context of TP review, have their origins in talk therapy. Given the pivotal part that the spoken word plays in this equation, the following sections will examine the various theoretical approaches to the research of language and social practice before moving on to illustrate some of the more grounded work on genres and how these are manifest in various communities of practice. Both of these theoretical discussions lead us to the actual source of data for language analysis in context, which comes in the form of corpus evidence and specific to this research, the POTTI corpus.

## **5. The role of language**

It is apparent in discussions so far in this chapter that language plays a major role as a tool in the development of cognitive skills (Vygotsky, 1978) and is also a form of data which encodes thoughts, philosophies and practices, as well as evidence of the progression of same, all vital in LTE. Discourse analysis, interaction analysis, conversation analysis, and content analysis have therefore been employed as



appropriate methodologies in reflective practice and action research. Freeman, (1996) traces the historical development of lines of inquiry using language as a way into the mind and as a vehicle for thought, through metaphor, story, personal history narratives etc (see also Wallace, 2003, Warford and Reeves, 2003, p. 50). The ‘representational view’ of language prevalent in the 60s and 70s focused on *what* was said and assumed that our words represent our thoughts. In this framework ‘words are taken as isomorphic to mental worlds’ (Freeman, 1996, p. 734) in an individualistic sense. However, it has been argued by Freeman that this type of extraction and analysis provides only part of the story and needs to be complemented by a more ‘presentational view’ based on a social approach to language emanating from work by Bakhtin, (1981) and Gee, (1989) and others (these are discussed in more detail in the following section). The focus in presentational paradigms is on *how* something is said, thereby preserving the socio-political origins of language while at the same time ‘working more fully with the complex nature of language data as language’ (Freeman, 1996, p. 734). This allows researchers to trace processes of learning and development evidenced in the language used by those under investigation. According to Freeman (1996, pp. 744-750), there are three central tenets to the presentational stance: systematicity, relationship, and source. The notion of systematicity comes from structural linguistics and makes paradigmatic contrasts (what is said versus what is not said) and also syntagmatic contrasts (what is said in relation to what precedes and follows it, both of which are interdependent and gain and hold agreement through social conventions. Speech communities create and sustain relative meanings on both axes. Relationship refers to the integration of the individual and the language as a ‘socially constructed voice’ in Bakhtinian tradition. The idea here is that voice exists only as part of social milieu and is constructed through social dialogue (Wertsch, 1998). Researchers must therefore interpret what

they hear as a representation of individuals within social communities and not as a neutral object. And thirdly, source of language refers to the speech community from which it is produced. The presentational approach therefore emphasizes the collective nature of language but in order to account for the place of the individual within this, Freeman (1996, p. 735) suggests a combination of representational and presentational approaches to language data as complimentary and inseparable, ‘their integration enhances and deepens data analysis and the understandings that result’, and provides two empirical examples of how this works in practice. All of these theoretical stances can help in the framing of specific spoken language analysis, and have done so in the case of the POTTI data in later sections.

## **6. Language in context: genre and communities of practice**

Analysts can better interpret spoken discourse through a careful consideration of the context in which it occurs as well as the speakers who produce it. In this paradigm language is seen as a social product. Socio-cultural theorists agree on the need to go beyond the isolated individual when trying to understand the relationship between mind and action (Burke, 1969, Lantolf and Appel, 1994, Mercer, 1995, Vygotsky, 1978). We also need to take account of the ‘instruments’ (Wertsch 1998, p. 24) or ‘cultural tools’ (Vygotsky, 1978) which individuals use to achieve their actions. These tools come in many forms, especially language. What is acceptable and appropriate in our utterances is determined historically and contemporarily by the culture (in the broadest sense) in which we are operating. Bakhtin’s work is especially relevant here (Bakhtin, 1981, Bakhtin, 1986) in many ways and has been prominent in the development and understanding of ‘genre’ (see also Jaworski and Coupland, 1999, McCarthy, 1998). In his writings he considers utterances to be potentially unique, individually styled and

unrepeatable, but on the other hand, ‘each sphere in which language is used develops its own *relatively stable types* of these utterances. These we call *speech genres*’ (Bakhtin, 1986, p. 60, italics in original). Genres are born historically, culturally, and socially through repeated echoings and reverberations of others’ utterances and are also filled with ‘dialogic overtones’ which take account of and reflect the prior thoughts, expressions, and ‘voices’ of these present and non-present others. Wertsch, (1998, pp. 293-294) explains ‘that each word tastes of the context and contexts in which it has lived its socially changed life; all words and forms are populated by intentions’ and he continues, ‘the word in language is half someone else’s. It becomes one’s own only when the speaker populates it with his own intention, his accent, when he appropriates the word, adapting it to his own semantic and expressive intention’. Bakhtin postulates that, although uniquely moulded, no utterance is new in the absolute sense. It is a composite of generic features and co-construction with other participants in the specific interaction. Such combinations give rise to a distinction between the ‘referential’ (semantic) and ‘expressive’ (emotive, evaluative) content of utterances indicated in Bakhtinian abstractions.

Genre analysis has most obviously found a home in the study and classification of various types of written discourse, and notable in the study of academic writing (for example, Bakhtin, 1981, Coxhead, 2000, Hyland, 2002, Johns and Swales, 2002, Kress, 1990, Nystrand, 1992, Swales, 1990), which has triggered a discussion of the role of genre relative to power, access, knowledge both socially and in education (Gee, 1989, Kress, 1990). However concepts of ‘intertextuality’ (Candlin and Maley, 1997, Fairclough, 1995, Fairclough, 1992), and ‘intersubjectivity’ (Rommetveit, 1985, Wertsch, 1998), both emanating from Bakhtin’s theories, have immediate relevance to

spoken language. Intertextuality refers to an inherent property of a text in how it evidences the histories of other texts and hence shares its meaning with them. In other words, how individual texts ‘manifest a plurality of text sources’ (Candlin and Maley, 1997, p. 203), associated with some relatively normative institutional and social meaning. Thus we can see commonalities and convergences within genres. The related notion of intersubjectivity is most often used to refer to ‘the degree to which interlocutors in a shared communicative situation share a perspective’ (Wertsch, 1998, p. 111), they move from their private worlds into a ‘shared social reality’ (Rommetveit, 1985) establishing a focus of joint attention. Reciprocal and mutual commitment is therefore a necessary condition, with bidirectional attention to the others’ perspective.

Co-emergent with considerations of genre is the inevitable attention to those communities engaged in its embryonic development and perpetuation. In a thirty year period we have witnessed, through formal published accounts, a conceptual broadening evolution from Labov’s notion of a ‘speech community’ (Labov, 1972), through Swales’ and Nystrand’s ‘discourse community’ (Nystrand, 1992, Swales, 1998), to Lave and Wenger’s ‘community of practice’ (Lave and Wenger, 1991), with ancillary discussions of ‘small cultures’ from Holliday (Holliday, 1999). Gee’s contemplation of ‘Discourses’ with a capital ‘D’ as ‘forms of life which integrate words, acts, values, beliefs, attitudes, and social identities as well as gestures, glances, body positions, and clothes’ (Gee, 1989, pp. 6-7), sees the amalgamation of socio-cultural perspectives inherent in Vygotskian notions of scaffolding combine with linguistic perspectives of genre and discourse through processes of socialisation in what Lave and Wenger, entitle ‘legitimate peripheral participation’ (Lave and Wenger, 1991). In this 1991 publication we see an early mention of ‘community of practice’ a concept and

framework later elaborated by Wenger, (1998). Gee's original idea is that while one can overtly teach a body of knowledge, for example linguistics, one cannot teach another how to be a linguist, 'the most you can do is to let them practice being a linguist with you' (Gee, 1989, p. 7). This fits well with the extended idea of a learning curriculum as something which can not 'be considered in isolation, manipulated in arbitrary didactic terms, or analyzed apart from the social relations that shape legitimate peripheral participation. A learning curriculum is thus characteristic of a community' (Lave and Wenger, 1991, p. 97). We therefore arrive at the abstraction of a community of practice (CoP) as a complex and dynamic entity which involves the frequent mutual engagement, joint enterprise and shared repertoire of its members. According to Wenger, (1998, pp. 125-126), there are common indicators that a CoP has formed. The most relevant of these for present purposes include the use of specific tools, representations, and other artefacts, local lore, shared stories, inside jokes, knowing laughter, jargon and shortcuts to communication as well as the ease of producing new ones, and a shared discourse reflecting a certain perspective on the world. As a approach, it is compatible with social-constructivism because of its dynamism and mutual and cooperative engagement (Holmes and Meyerhoff, 1999, p. 179), and in many ways is reminiscent of a modern paradigm of apprenticeship. Having discussed theoretical approaches to language and a structured consideration of its context (through notions of genre) and use (through notions of communities of practice), it is now necessary to consider the methodological tools and procedures that are most conducive to the efficient organisation and extraction of the language for analytical purposes. This brings us to corpus-based approaches.

## **7. The place of computerized spoken corpora**

Corpus linguistics is a methodology (for a discussion of its methodological status see Tognini-Bonelli, 2001) which can be, and has been, used as an approach in many disciplines. Corpus software has a number of advantages for users: it produces word lists and counts occurrences of individual search items, it allows for the presentation and (re)organisation of data in a way that facilitates the identification of patterns, it automatically produces cluster and collocation lists, and most software has a 'key word' tool which allows a comparison of lexis between corpora to identify relatively significant items. On the other hand, it gives easy access to spoken interactions for examples of language which can be used in a more interpretative way. Two broad approaches have developed within the field of corpus linguistics. McCarthy, Matthiessen and Slade, (2002, p. 70), exemplify as follows;

Broadly, corpus linguistics may be performed in two ways: quantitative and qualitative. The quantitative approach usually looks for the largest corpus possible.....from as wide a range of sources as possible. These data are then analyzed computationally and the output comprises sets of figures that tell the discourse analyst about the frequency of occurrence of words, phrases, collocations or structures. These statistics are then used to produce dictionaries, grammars, and so on. But for the discourse analyst, statistical facts raise the question *Why?*, and the answers can only be found by looking at the contexts of the texts in the corpus. Discourse analysts, therefore, work with corpora in a qualitative way.

In this way, corpus researchers in the latter tradition use statistics to formulate and check hypotheses and research questions to be explored more closely in a qualitative way (for example, Farr and O'Keeffe, 2002, Koester, 2001, McCarthy, 2002, McCarthy, 1998, McCarthy, 2003, O'Keeffe, 2003, O'Keeffe and Farr, 2003, Tao and McCarthy, 2001). At the other end of the continuum, linguists focus strongly on

frequencies, patterns, recurrence (for example, Biber, 1990, Biber, 1993, Biber, Conrad and Reppen, 1998, Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad and Finegan, 1999, Fox, 1998, Hunston, 1995, Hunston and Francis, 1998, Kennedy, 2002, Sinclair, 1997). This does not mean to suggest that one approach excludes the other, simply that one takes precedence over the other resulting from differences in research interest and objectives. This befits the premise that ‘neither the quantitative data of a corpus alone nor the one-off analysis of conversational fragments is sufficient, and that much extra insight can be gained by working from the former to the latter and vice-versa, keeping both in constant dialectal relationship’ (McCarthy and Handford, Forthcoming). The following analytical sections of this chapter will use POTTI in both ways as a tool for describing the nature of oral behaviour and participation in the context. In this sense, the spoken word is a primary and necessary data source for reflecting on how we conduct reflection in LTE, thereby completing the reflective loop (Schön, 1991, Schön, 1983). The underlying assumption is that such research leads to deeper understandings, which will ultimately promote continuous professional development. Freeman, (2001a, p. 7), in his discussions on the current state of teacher training, emphasizes the need to draw on the past to forecast the present. This, he argues, can be most effectively done through reflection on practices which have been appropriately documented. Wallace, (1998, p. 4), rationalizes further:

1. It is a way of accelerating and enhancing our expertise, and it turns problems into positive versus negative experiences
2. It allows us to identify areas for self-development and at the same time raises awareness of professional strengths
3. It results in increased effectiveness
4. It promotes a healthy spirit of inquiry and research.

The discussion so far has brought us through snapshots of some of the theoretical issues and approaches that can be used to envelop spoken language analyses, which, in this case, can aid in LTE professional development and reflection. The remainder of this chapter is devoted to the primary exploration of one such spoken language corpus.

## **8. The genre of POTTI: a qualitative analysis**

Amidst conflicting findings in relation to teacher and trainee preferences for prescriptive versus collaborative supervision (Bax, 1997, Copeland, 1980, Copeland, 1982, Copeland and Atkinson, 1978, Perlberg and Theodor, 1975) there remains one constant, affective factors are highly significant and feedback is better received when it is ‘tempered by mutual respect, a warm and pleasant manner, a lucid and organized presentation of one’s point of view, and a recognition of strengths as well as weaknesses’ (Wallace, 1991, p. 116, see also Goldhammer, Anderson and Krajewski, 1980, Gore, 1991, Gower, 1988, Holland, 1989, Hoover, O’Shea and Carroll, 1988, Maynard and Furlong, 1995, Randall and Thornton, 2001, Wajnryb, 1992, Woodward, 1992). Notions of nurturing, care-giving, sponsoring, encouraging, counselling, and befriending among others have all been cited as central to the process (Anderson and Lucasse-Shannon, 1995, p. 32). One aspect that seems to remain constant throughout the literature is the importance afforded to effective oral communication and the provision of psychological and interpersonal support for trainees (Elliot and Calderhead, 1995, Hoover, O’Shea and Carroll, 1988, Koerner, O’Connell-Rust and Baumgarter, 2002, Roberts, 1998). A number of prerequisite conditions and dispositions have been deemed conducive to establishing and maintaining an effective and affective feedback environment. These have manifested themselves within a number of proposed frameworks over the last number of years, many of which have



their roots in theories of client-centred counselling. One which is adapted in this section is Heron's division between effective authoritative and facilitative interventions (Randall and Thornton, 2001). Added to these are the not so successful strategies, or what Heron calls degenerative interventions, otherwise known as immature or neurotic defences (Boote, 2003). There is often a fine line between when a strategy is effective in a confrontational way and when it breaks down in degeneration. An analysis of the spoken data shows the full range to be present in POTTI, where they seem to be the combined result of the co-operative interactive efforts of both parties. This section may at times also draw on concepts from the field of discourse analysis, most notably pragmatic frameworks such as politeness theory (Brown and Levinson, 1978, Goffman, 1967) and speech act theory (Austin, 1962, Searle, 1969). Before beginning the analysis some details of the context and the participants may help the reader's interpretation through the remainder of this chapter.

The POTTI corpus is 81,944 words and consists of 14 feedback sessions. The recorded feedback takes place in the physical context of the university-based office of the relevant trainer. Only the relevant trainer and trainee are present in each session. This location in which recording takes place is that used in all feedback sessions in normal situations and is not therefore artificial in that sense. Feedback usually takes place at any time up to three days after the TP lesson, although there is a general tendency to do feedback the following day. Each session lasts between twenty-five and forty-five minutes, with an average of thirty minutes per session. The sessions recorded in POTTI take place in Weeks 6, 7 and 8 of the first semester of a two semester MA in TEFL programme. TP started in Week 4, so each trainee had participated in a minimum of two feedback sessions before the recordings commenced. Two trainers and seven trainees are recorded.

Both trainers are female. Fionnuala (all names are pseudonyms) is older with considerable teaching experience and had been employed on a part-time basis by UL for seven years at the time of the recordings. Edwina, is a newly employed trainer/academic, with just three years' training experience at the time. Four of the trainee participants are female and three are male. All but one of the males are Irish. Participants are aged between twenty and thirty-five years of age, and only one of the males had any considerable teaching experience before starting the programme. All trainees hold primary degrees from a range of academic disciplines. This short description of the speakers and the location of the data should contextualize the analysis below, which begins with a qualitative exploration before moving to a more corpus-based investigation. The degree to which one might generalise from the following analysis is difficult to speculate and while I feel relatively confident that the quantitative results might be reflective of other contexts similar to that of POTTI, this is probably much less true for the specific samples that follow in the next section. However in many ways the issue of generalisation is at odds with the type of approach espoused here, which aims to promote local explorations in local contexts for local solutions to local problems. If others should see similarities or findings that they find relevant then this is an additional benefit rather than the intended aim in the present chapter.

### **8.1 Authoritative interventions**

In Heron's model authoritative interventions can take any of a number of strategies, all of which can be identified in POTTI.

### **8.1.1 Prescriptive interventions**

The most obvious way of being authoritative is by being prescriptive. This is where the advisor proposes, recommends and suggests that the trainee carries out certain things in TP or refrains from doing so. Prescription can range from being highly directive to highly consultative. The trainer can employ a hierarchical stance in relation to the trainee, use direct speech acts, be on-record, and use few hedging devices, or, prescription can be much more consultative, with trainer and trainee building the advice together. This is evidenced in the following extract, where we see the trainer going to great lengths to co-construct the advice through elicitation; see the movement from questions on lines 2, 11, 14, which, because of their limited success in prompting the required responses, are followed by more directive techniques from line 16 onwards, where the trainer takes more authoritative control of the interaction. The trainee, eager to participate and offer her contribution, initially provides extended responses to the trainer's questions, acknowledges the trainer's switch to more prescription on line 16 through the use of 'right' in line 18, and afterwards also continues to contribute in a way that shows agreement or tries to pre-empt the trainer's comments (e.g. line 21), as well as deferring to the trainer's insights through her response tokens on lines 26 (right), 32, 46, 49 (yeah), and 35, 41, 51 (mmhm). They finally reach the desired directive 'the instructions need to be ah a lot clearer' (line 53), some 40 turns after the initial question is asked by the trainer (the transcription symbols are illustrated in Appendix 1).

**Insert Extract 1 here**

### **8.1.2 Informative interventions**

A second type of authoritative intervention is the provision of information. This is done to provide instruction and is very much in the mode of teaching the trainee in the feedback session. It is done in a number of ways. Firstly, the trainer can provide technical advice on the language content of the lesson, which may not have been dealt with very well in the TP lesson. Some examples from POTTI include the trainee's inability to explain differences between the following pairs of lexical items: injury/wound, rob/steal, bill/cheque. In addition, the trainer often tackles the more sensitive and face-threatening issue of the trainee's personal use of language. The following extract illustrates how the trainer corrects the trainee's pronunciation of certain words. The face-threat is heightened by the fact that the trainee is a native speaker of English, and this type of informative intervention therefore has the potential to carry the perlocutionary force of a criticism. Hence, we see much consultation (e.g. lines 5, 6), hedging (e.g. line 1 'a difficult area'), and other solidarity and self-disclosure strategies (e.g. lines 11, 12 'all of us would..') employed by the trainer. In fact it is bordering at times on a degenerative intervention in what Randall and Thornton call 'pussyfooting' (2001, p. 84). It takes 45 turns for the trainer to inform the trainee that she is incorrectly pronouncing the word boil. We say traces of avoidance, for example, line 5, and displacement (Boote, 2003, p. 266) during the entire discussion on the pronunciation of 'pen' and 'pin', which the trainer had already established was not a problematic issue for this particular trainee. Pragmatic forces are clearly at play.

**Insert Extract 2 here**

Personal interpretation is identified by Randall and Thornton (2001, p. 111) as being another type of informative intervention and is pervasive in all of the tapescripts in POTTI. Its obvious nature does not merit specific attention. However the use of metaphor as an informative strategy is often present. In one instance when the trainer is advising on physical movement and positioning in the classroom, she uses football and goalkeeping as a comparative.

### **8.1.3 Confrontational interventions**

We saw earlier that the trainer criticism on issues of pronunciation of certain words was met by a preferred response from the trainee, who supports and reinforces the negative assessment. Therefore the episode falls within the illocutionary and perlocutionary realm of informational. It is accepted and resolved and the episode does not degenerate to any extent. There are other occasions, such as that illustrated below, when the trainer's critical assessment becomes much more confrontational and borders on degeneration. This happens when the assessment, although acknowledged by all trainees as being one of the anticipated happenings in a feedback session, meets with a dispreferred response of disagreement (Pomerantz, 1984a). In this extract the trainer has questions the personality traits of the trainee who had been particularly harsh and pedantic with her students (see also Farr, forthcoming).

### **Insert Extract 3 here**

This extract opens with a blatant and unhedged divergence of opinion by the trainee in line 7. The trainer attempts to diffuse the potential conflict through distancing and displacement to a completely different context in lines 10 and 12, 13. The reference is

to a TP preparation session where the trainer has been the tutor. This acts as an immediate side-step by the trainer and allows her to introduce a series of compliments before returning to the criticism. The exclamatory trainee question in line 15 affirms that the conflictual stance remains unchanged and even her 'okay' response in line 17 is not convincing to the trainer as evidenced in line 18 where the trainer offers an apology. Despite the trainee's apparent pacification in line 19 the trainer, sensing the mood, feels it necessary to depersonalize the situation and make reference to the video evidence in line 21. She has judged the situation to be irreconcilable on the basis of personal interpretation and introspection. The introduction of external evidence firmly re-establishes the trainer's position of authority and allows her to make the categorical statement in line 23. Phillips, 1999 (1999, p. 195) refers to this concept as 'neutrality', Pomerantz, (1984b) terms it 'evidence' and 'evidentiality', and other pragmatics have included it under the broader term 'reference' (for example, Yule, 1996). Throughout the data the introduction of external authority, (mainly in the form of documented theory and reference to other trainers advice), and objective video evidence is used to settle difficult moments such as this one and usually does so effectively and efficiently as it gives added weight and authority to the trainer putting her out of the reach of argumentation, dispute or contradiction. It protects her negative face (Brown and Levinson, 1978) and achieves the desired outcome and resolves the issue, finally ensuring the preferred agreement in line 24.

## **8.2 Facilitative interventions**

In addition to the use of the type of authoritative interventions just discussed, Heron also acknowledges what he calls facilitative interventions. Facilitative strategies from POTTI are illustrated and discussed in this section. Some new illustrations are provided

but reference to some of the extracts already presented in the previous section will also be used to exemplify.

### **8.2.1. Supportive interventions**

A typical supportive strategy in POTTI is validation, which takes the forms of praising, complimenting, boosting etc. The following table provides an example of the type of lexis employed for validation purposes. The items in the following table have been chosen on the basis of a qualitative examination of the discourse combined with their appearance on some of the POTTI frequency and/or keyword lists. The negative meanings of some of these words have been excluded in the statistics presented (for example, *not great*, *not good* etc).

### **Insert Table 1 here**

Clearly there is a lot of praise and encouragement going on through the validation of the actions of the trainees, through the use of words such as *good*, *interesting* etc. This is important for building confidence.

Apologizing is another supportive strategy used by both parties in POTTI. It indicates mutual respect and deference. The following extract is a good example of both parties engaging in the act of apologizing, with both parties granting each other's request for forgiveness, before moving on to a different topic.

### **Insert Extract 4 here**

### **8.2.2 Catalytic interventions**

Facilitation can also take the form of promoting critical thinking, probing, questioning and elicitation. This type of intervention is evident in the type of consultative direction already illustrated in Extract 1 above.

### **8.2.3 Cathartic interventions**

Anxiety and defensiveness can be dealt through open discussion of emotional states instead of avoiding or suppressing them. The POTTI data shows trainees talking about personal issues, especially in relation to how nervous they felt during the lesson, their lack confidence, career choice, difficulty in personal circumstances, and often reciprocal trainer disclosure coincides. The following extract provides one example.

**Insert Extract 5 here**

## **9. Participation and interactivity in POTTI**

This section uses the corpus in a much more quantitative way to examine degrees of participation and interactivity in the discourse (Wordsmith Tools was used for the analysis). Phillips, (1999, p. 91), using just one pre-service feedback session of approximately twenty minutes, found a trainer/trainee split of 64per cent/36per cent participation, measured by the number of words uttered by each party as a percentage of the total number of words uttered. The results from POTTI, based on all 14 sessions, are almost identical with trainer talk (2 trainees) accounting for 63.57per cent, and



trainee talk (7 trainees) being at 36.43per cent. On average, trainers speak almost twice as much as trainees. The precise breakdown per session is included in Table 2 below.

### **Insert Table 2 here**

This table shows that in all cases the trainer speaks more than the trainee. Session 3 shows the most even distribution of talk between both parties with just over two percentage points difference, while 14 is the session which contains most deviation from the average with the trainer speaking three and a half times as much as the trainee. Very interestingly, these two sessions are conducted by different trainers. However, the individualized nature of each session and the tailoring ability of the trainer is evidence by the fact that these statistics show no notable trends for one trainer or another to consistently speak more in their feedback sessions, with both trainers reaching into the fifty and seventy percentage bracket on occasion. On the other hand, there is a notable trend among the female trainees to speak approximately the same amount in sessions with both trainers. None of the four female trainees differ by more than 5.6 percentage points in the number of words they utter in each of their two sessions, and Joanne differs least with just a 1.4per cent difference between her session 7 with Fionnuala, and her session 10 with Edwina. The three males, on the other hand show an average of almost 10 percent difference between their two sessions with different trainers, although there is no trend evident in relation to which trainer they prefer to speak more with. This raises a question in relation to the influence of gender on accommodation in POTTI, but one which cannot adequately be explored or resolved using the data distribution design employed.

Measures of interactivity are also useful for describing the participatory nature of different registers. Based on research by Biber (1988, 1995), Csomay, (2002) uses a classification system of number of turns per 1000 words of discourse and suggests that fewer than 10 turns per 1000 words is lowly interactive and more than 25 turns per 1000 words is highly interactive. Poos and Simpson, (2002), similarly based on previous work by Biber, propose a three-tier system of discourse modes: monologic, interactive, and mixed. The POTTI data, using such measures is pitched on the highly interactive end of the scale. It contains, in 81,944 words, 5,776 turns, giving 70.45 turns per 1000 words, almost three times in excess of the required 25 suggested by Csomay as an indicator of high interactivity. Although some of these turns consist of minimal responses and acknowledgement tokens (see Farr, 2003), which may skew slightly the interactivity statistics. Nonetheless, I would argue that such responses are also valuable indicators of engaged listenership, and I therefore include them in my measures of interactivity. However, looking at interactivity in this way leads to perhaps, a more insightful investigation of the length of utterance in POTTI. The average utterance length for the entire corpus is 14.19 words. The average utterance length per trainer is 18.03 words, in line with the above average amount of talk they engage in, and per trainee it is 10.37 words. Table 3 illustrates utterance lengths per speaker in the data, computed as mean paragraph length by the software.

### **Insert Table 3 here**

The data in this table again show a consistently longer average length of utterance by trainers vis a vis trainees, although only very marginally in session 3, in line with its closeness in number of words uttered by each of the participants as seen in Table 2.

There are no trends obvious from this data to show consistency among individual trainers or trainees, except that some trainees, such as Michael, have average turns shorter than those uttered by others such as Lorna.

## **10. Conclusion**

The centrality of action research and reflective practice in language teaching and LTE has been forefronted by authors such as Michael Wallace and Julian Edge. These and other proponents hold strong convictions that some, ‘of the most effective ways of solving professional problems, and of continuing to improve and develop as a teacher, teacher trainer, or manager in ELT is through reflection on our professional practice’ (Wallace, 1998, p. 1).

Through this formal framework actions and experiences are recorded and shared so that we can better understand the processes in which we are involved, and ultimately make a difference to the quality of these actions and experiences. The intention should ideally be to learn and not justify (Edge, 2001, p. 6). ‘Action research is teacher development made explicit’ (Edge and Hancioglu, 2001, p. 7). Clearly, there is a need for collection procedures and analysis to be systematic, formalized and properly documented if this process is to be considered valid. We are operating in educational systems where external validation and transparency is more important than ever in light of a more general decreased confidence in the professions resulting from the various professional, vocational, and public improprieties of our time. Notions of self-examination, scrutiny, and preservation are now paramount, and Schön (1991), even suggests that many professions now require formal evidence of professional reflection and development for continued eligibility for membership. Myers and Clark, (2002, p. 50) conclude that continued professional development is crucial for individuals and their organisations,

should be continuous and lifelong (Randall and Thornton, 2001, p. 55), and should happen at the 'meta' level so that any resultant modifications in practice are more than superficial. Additionally, such research allows for the localisation of solutions based on local problems, an approach which has been advocated in teacher training (Gill, 1997). The collection and transcription of spoken language corpora is an example of a perfect facility with on-going ease of access and in-built transparency. This chapter has illustrated the use of a corpus to qualitatively examine the types of interventions used in TP feedback and to quantitatively investigate participation frameworks. However the same or other corpora could be used in a number of different and complementary ways to complete the picture of our professional practice. Additionally, the insider's view, or what anthropologists call the 'emic perspective' (Patton, 1990, p. 241, see also Gall, Borg and Gall, 1996, Lazaraton, 2003, Phillips, 1999), can be obtained through elicitations from the actors (for example, through questionnaires, notes, think-aloud protocols etc), or more directly by employing a participative researcher research paradigm (Freeman, 1996, Heron, 1996, Morrow and Schocker, 1993). Both were employed in the larger POTTI research project but present limitations prevent elaboration here. All of these actions, measures and reports provide the destabilisation necessary (arguably) for the prevention of potential complacency in our LTE professional practices.

Anderson, E. M. and A. Lucasse-Shannon, Toward a conceptualization of mentoring, in Kerry, T. and A. Shelton-Mayes, *Issues in Mentoring* (London/New York: Routledge in Association with The Open University, 1995), pp. 25-34.

Austin, J., *How To Do Things With Words* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1962).

Bailey, F., M. Hawkins, S. Irujo, D. Larsen-Freeman, E. Rintell and J. Willett, 'Language teacher educators collaborative conversations', *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 3 (1998) 536-546.

Bailey, K. M., B. Bergthold, B. Braunstein, N. Jagodzinski-Fleischman, M. P. Holbrook, J. Tuman, X. Waissbluth and L. J. Zambo, The language learner's autobiography: Examining the "apprenticeship of observation", in Freeman, D. and J. C. Richards, *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 11-29.

Bakhtin, M. M., *The Dialogic Imagination. Four Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1981).

Bakhtin, M. M., The problem of speech genres, in Emerson, C. and M. Holquist, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1986), pp. 60-102.

Bax, S., 'Roles for a teacher educator in context-sensitive teacher education', *English Language Teaching Journal*, 51, 3 (1997) 232 - 241.

Bax, S., and R. Cullen, Generating and evaluating reflection through teaching practice, in Gollin, J., G. Ferguson, and H. Trappes-Lomax, *Proceedings of*

*Symposium for Language Teacher Educators, Edinburgh, 2000, 2001, 2002.*

(Edinburgh: IALS, CD Publication, 2003).

Beyer, L. E., Teacher education, reflective inquiry and moral action, in Tabachnick, B. R. and K. M. Zeichner, *Issues and Practices in Inquiry-Oriented Teacher Education* (New York: Falmer Press, 1991), pp. 113-129.

Biber, D., *Variation across Speech and Writing* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988).

Biber, D., 'Methodological issues regarding corpus-based analyses of linguistic variation', *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 5, 4 (1990) 257-269.

Biber, D., 'Representativeness in corpus design', *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 8, 4 (1993) 243-257.

Biber, D., *Dimensions of Register Variation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Biber, D., S. Conrad and R. Reppen, *Corpus Linguistics: Investigating Language Structure and Use* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Biber, D., S. Johansson, G. Leech, S. Conrad and E. Finegan, *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English* (London/New York: Longman, 1999).

Boote, D. N., 'An "indoctrination dilemma" in teacher education?' *Journal of Educational Thought*, 35, 1 (2001) 61-82.

- Boote, D. N., 'Teacher educators as belief and attitude therapists: exploring psychodynamic implications of an emerging role', *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 9, 3 (2003) 257-277.
- Breen, M., The evaluation cycle for language learning tasks, in Johnson, R. K., *The Second Language Curriculum* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), pp. 187-206.
- Brown, P. and S. Levinson, Universals in language usage: politeness phenomena, in Goody, E. N., *Questions and politeness* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1978), pp. 56-289.
- Burke, K., *A Grammar of Motives* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1969).
- Burns, A., Starting all over again: From teaching adults to teaching beginners, in Freeman, D. and J. C. Richards, *Teacher Learning in Language Teaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), pp. 154-177.
- Byrnes, H., 'Shaping the discourse of a practice: the role of linguistics and psychology in language teaching and learning', *Modern Language Journal*, 84, 4 (2000) 472-484.
- Candlin, C. N. and Y. Maley, Intertextuality and interdiscursivity in the discourse of alternative dispute resolution, in Gunnarsson, B.-L., P. Linell and B. Nordberg, *The Construction of Professional Discourse* (London/New York: Longman, 1997), pp. 201-221.
- Carter, K. and W. Doyle, Personal narrative and life history in learning to teach, in Sikula, J., *The Handbook of Research on Teacher Education. 2nd Ed.* (New York: Macmillan, 1996), pp. 120-142.

- Copeland, W. D., 'Affective dispositions of teachers in training toward examples of supervisory behavior', *Journal of Educational Research*, 74, 1 (1980) 37-42.
- Copeland, W. D., 'Student teachers' preference for supervisory approach', *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33, 2 (1982) 32-36.
- Copeland, W. D. and D. R. Atkinson, 'Student teachers' perceptions of directive and non-directive supervisor behavior', *Journal of Educational Research*, 71, (1978) 123-126.
- Coxhead, A., 'A new academic word list', *TESOL Quarterly*, 34, 2 (2000) 213-238.
- Crookes, G., 'What influences what and how second and foreign language teachers teach?' *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, i (1997) 67-79.
- Csomay, E., Variation in academic lectures: interactivity and level of instruction, in Reppen, R., S. Fitzmaurice and D. Biber, *Using Corpora to Explore Linguistic Variation* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002), pp. 203-224.
- Day, R. R., Models and the knowledge base of second language teacher education, in Sadtono, E., *Issues in Language Teacher Education* (Singapore: Seameo Regional Language Centre, 1991), pp. 38-48.
- Duff, T., The preparation and development of teacher trainers, in Duff, T., *Explorations in Teacher Training. Problems and Issues*. (London: Longman, 1988), pp. 110-117.
- Edge, J., 'Search and re-search', *English Teaching Professional*, 20 (2001) 5-7.



Edge, J. and D. Hancioglu, 'TDTR - teacher development and classroom research', *IATEFL Issues*, 162 (2001) 7.

Edge, J. and K. Richards, 'Why *best practice* is not good enough', *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 3 (1998) 569-576.

Elbaz, F., 'The teacher's "practical knowledge": report of a case study', *Curriculum Inquiry*, 11, 1 (1981) 43-71.

Elbaz, F., 'Research on teacher's knowledge: the evolution of a discourse', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 23, 1 (1991) 1-19.

Elliot, B. and J. Calderhead, Mentoring for teacher development: possibilities and caveats, in Kerry, T. and A. Shelton-Mayes, *Issues in Mentoring* (London/New York: Routledge in Association with the Open University, 1995), pp. 35-58.

Fairclough, N., *Discourse and Social Change* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992).

Fairclough, N., *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (London/New York: Longman, 1995).

Fang, Z., 'A review of research on teacher beliefs and practices', *Educational Research*, 38, 1 (1996) 48-65.

Farr, F., Relational strategies in the discourse of professional performance review in an Irish academic environment: the case of language teacher education, in Schneider, K. and A. Barron, *Variational Pragmatics: The Case of English in Ireland* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, forthcoming).

Farr, F., 'Engaged listenership in spoken academic discourse: the case of student-tutor meetings', *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2, 1 (2003) 67-85.

Farr, F. and A. O'Keeffe, Would as a hedging device in an Irish context: an intra-varietal comparison of institutionalised spoken interaction, in Reppen, R., S.

Fitzmaurice and D. Biber, *Using Corpora to Explore Linguistic Variation* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002), pp. 25-48.

Fox, G., Using corpus data in the classroom, in Tomlinson, B., *Materials Development in Language Teaching* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), pp. 25-43.

Freeman, D., 'To take them at their word': language data in the study of teachers' knowledge', *Harvard Educational Review*, 66, 4 (1996) 732-761.

Freeman, D., 'Rethinking the tools of the trade: teacher learning and trainer learning', *The IATEFL Teacher Trainers and Educators SIG Newsletter*, 1 (2001a) 7-8.

Freeman, D., Second language teacher education, in Carter, R. and D. Nunan, *The Cambridge Guide to Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001b), pp. 72-79.

Freeman, D. and K. E. Johnson, 'Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education', *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 3 (1998) 397-417.

Gall, M. D., W. R. Borg, and J. P. Gall (Eds), *Educational Research: An Introduction* (New York: Longman, 1996).

Gee, J. P., 'Literacy, discourse, and linguistics: introduction', *Journal of Education*, 171, 1 (1989) 5-17.

- Gill, S., Local problems, local solutions, in McGrath, I., *Learning to Train: Perspectives on the Development of Language Teacher Trainers* (Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall, 1997), pp. 215-224.
- Goffman, E., *Interaction Ritual. Essays on Face-to-Face Behaviour* (New York: Anchor/Doubleday, 1967).
- Goldhammer, R., R. H. Anderson and R. J. Krajewski, *Clinical supervision: special methods for the supervision of teachers* (USA: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc., 1980).
- Golombek, P. R., 'A study of language teachers' personal practical knowledge', *TESOL Quarterly*, 32, 3 (1998) 447-464.
- Gore, J. M., Practicing what we preach: action research and the supervision of teachers, in Tobachnick, B. R. and K. M. Zeichner, *Issues and Practices in Inquiry-Oriented Teacher Education* (New York: Falmer Press, 1991), pp. 253-272.
- Gower, R., Are trainees human?, in Duff, T., *Explorations in Teacher Training. Problems and Issues*. (London: Longman, 1988), pp. 20-26.
- Heron, J., *Co-operative Inquiry. Research into the Human Condition* (London: Sage, 1996).
- Holland, P. E., 'Implicit assumptions about the supervisory conference: a review and analysis of literature', *Journal of Curriculum and Supervision*, 4, 4 (1989) 362-379.
- Holliday, A., 'Small cultures', *Applied Linguistics*, 20, 2 (1999) 237-264.

- Holmes, J. and M. Meyerhoff, 'The community of practice: theories and methodologies in language and gender research', *Language in Society*, 28, 2 (1999) 173-183.
- Hoover, N. L., L. J. O'Shea and R. G. Carroll, 'The supervision-intern relationship and effective interpersonal communication skills', *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39, 2 (1988) 17-21.
- Hunston, S., 'Grammar in teacher education: the role of a corpus', *Language Awareness*, 4, 1 (1995) 15-31.
- Hunston, S. and G. Francis, 'Verbs observed: a corpus-driven pedagogic grammar', *Applied Linguistics*, 19, 1 (1998) 45-72.
- Hyland, K., 'Genre: language, context and literacy', *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 22, (2002) 113-135.
- Jaworski, A. and N. Coupland, Introduction: perspectives on discourse analysis, in Jaworski, A. and N. Coupland, *The Discourse Reader* (London: Routledge, 1999), pp. 1-44.
- Johns, A. and J. Swales, 'Literacy and disciplinary practices: opening and closing perspectives', *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 1, 1 (2002) 13-28.
- Johnson, K. E., 'The role of theory in L2 teacher education', *TESOL Quarterly*, 30, 4 (1996) 765-771.
- Kennedy, C., Training trainers as change agents, in McGrath, I., *Learning to Train: Perspectives on the Development of Language Teacher Trainers* (Hemel Hempstead: Prentice Hall, 1997), pp. 127-139.

- Kennedy, G., Variation in the distribution of modal verbs in the British National Corpus, in Reppen, R., S. Fitzmaurice and D. Biber, *Using Corpora to Explore Linguistic Variation* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002), pp. 73-90.
- Kinging, C., 'A discourse approach to the study of language educators' coherence systems', *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, i (1997) 6-14.
- Koerner, M., F. O'Connell-Rust and F. Baumgartner, 'Exploring roles in student teaching placements', *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 29, 2 (2002) 35-58.
- Koester, A., *Interpersonal Markers in Workplace Genres: Pursuing Transactional and Relational Goals in Office Talk* (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Nottingham, 2001).
- Korthagen, F. and T. Russell, Teachers who teach teachers: some final considerations, in Russell, T. and F. Korthagen, *Teachers Who Teach Teachers* (London/Washington: Falmer Press, 1995), pp. 187-192.
- Kramsch, C., *Language and Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).
- Kramsch, C., 'Second language acquisition, applied linguistics, and the teaching of foreign languages', *Modern Language Journal*, 84, 3 (2000) 311-326.
- Kress, G., 'Two kinds of power: Gunter Kress on genre', *The English Magazine*, 24, (1990) 4-7.
- Labov, W., The study of language in its social context, in Pride, J. B. and J. Holmes, *Sociolinguistics* (Middlesex: Penguin, 1972), pp. 180-202.

Lantolf, J. P., 'A century of language teaching and research: looking back and looking ahead', *Modern Language Journal*, 84, 4 (2000) 467-471.

Lantolf, J. P., 'A century of language teaching and research: looking back and looking ahead, part 2', *Modern Language Journal*, 85, 1 (2001) 1-4.

Lantolf, J. P. and G. Appel, Theoretical framework: an introduction to Vygotskian approaches to second language research, in Lantolf, J. P. and G. Appel, *Vygotskian Approaches to Second Language Research* (New Jersey: Ablex, 1994), pp. 1-32.

Lave, J. and E. Wenger, *Situated Learning. Legitimate Peripheral Participation*. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Lazaraton, A., 'Evaluative criteria for qualitative research in applied linguistics: whose criteria and whose research', *Modern Language Journal*, 87, 1 (2003) 1-12.

Lieberman, A., 'Collaborative research: working with, not working on....' *Educational Leadership*, 43, (1986) 28-32.

Lortie, D. C., *School-teacher: A Sociological Study* (Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press, 1975).

Mann, S. G., An evaluation of tutor-led feedback in the context of initial teacher training in EFL, in Gollin, J., G. Ferguson, and H. Trappes-Lomax, *Proceedings of Symposium for Language Teacher Educators, Edinburgh, 2000, 2001, 2002*. (Edinburgh: IALS, CD Publication, 2003).

Maynard, T. and J. Furlong, Learning to teach and models of mentoring, in Kerry, T. and A. Shelton-Mayes, *Issues in Mentoring* (London/New York: Routledge in Association with The Open University, 1995), pp. 10-24.

McCarthy, M. J., *Spoken Language and Applied Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

McCarthy, M. J., *Issues in Applied Linguistics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

McCarthy, M. J., Good listenership made plain: British and American non-minimal response tokens in everyday conversation, in Reppen, R., S. M. Fitzmaurice and D. Biber, *Using corpora to explore linguistic variation* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002), pp. 49-72.

McCarthy, M. J., 'Talking back: "small" interactional response tokens in everyday conversation', *Research in Language and Social Interaction*, 36, (2003) 33-63.

McCarthy, M. J. and R. Carter, 'Spoken grammar: what is it and how can we teach it?' *English Language Teaching Journal*, 49, 3 (1995) 207-218.

McCarthy, M. J. and M. Handford, 'Invisible to us': a preliminary corpus-based study of spoken business English, in Connor, U. and T. Upton, *Discourse in the Professions: Perspectives from Corpus Linguistics* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, Forthcoming).

McCarthy, M. J., C. Matthiessen and D. Slade, Discourse analysis, in Schmitt, N., *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics* (London: Arnold, 2002), pp. 55-73.

Mercer, N., *The Guided Construction of Knowledge. Talk Amongst Teachers and Learners*. (Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, 1995).

Morrow, K. and M. Schocker, 'Process evaluation in an INSET course', *English Language Teaching Journal*, 47, 1 (1993) 47-55.

Myers, M. and S. Clark, CPD, lifelong learning and going meta, in Edge, J., *Continuing Professional Development. Some of our Perspectives*. (Kent: IATEFL, 2002), pp. 50-62.

Nystrand, M., Social interactionism versus social constructionism: Bakhtin, Rommetveit, and the semiotics of written text, in Heen-Wold, A., *The Dialogic Alternative. Towards a Theory of Language and Mind* (Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1992), pp. 157-174.

O'Keeffe, A., *Strangers on the Line: A Corpus-based Lexico-grammatical Analysis of Radio Phone-in*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Limerick, 2003).

O'Keeffe, A. and F. Farr, 'Using language corpora in language teacher education: pedagogic, linguistic and cultural insights', *TESOL Quarterly*, 37, 3 (2003) 389-418.

Oxford, R., 'Constructivism: shape-shifting, substance, and teacher education applications', *Journal of Education*, 72, 1 (1997) 35-66.

Patton, M. Q., *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods* (London: Sage, 1990).

Pennington, M. C., 'The teacher change cycle', *TESOL Quarterly*, 29, 4 (1995) 705-731.

Perlberg, A. and E. Theodor, 'Patterns and styles in the supervision of teachers', *British Journal of Teacher Education*, 1, (1975) 203-211.

Phillips, D., *The Feedback Session within the Context of Teacher Training and Development: An Analysis of Discourse, Role and Function*. (Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of London, 1999).



Pomerantz, A., Agreeing and disagreeing with assessments: some features of preferred/dispreferred turn shapes, in Maxwell, J., J. Atkinson and D. Heritage, *Structures of Social Action. Studies in Conversation Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984a), pp. 57-101.

Pomerantz, A., 'Giving a source or basis: the practice in conversation of telling "How I know"', *Journal of Pragmatics*, 8, (1984b) 607-625.

Poos, D. and R. Simpson, Cross-disciplinary comparisons of hedging: some findings from the Michigan Corpus of Academic Spoken English, in Reppen, R., S. Fitzmaurice and D. Biber, *Using Corpora to Explore Linguistic Variation* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002), pp. 3-24.

Randall, M. and B. Thornton, *Advising and Supporting Teachers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

Roberts, J., *Language Teacher Education* (New York: Arnold, 1998).

Rommetveit, R., Language acquisition as increasing linguistic structuring of experience and symbolic behaviour control, in Wertsch, J. V., *Culture, Communication and Cognition. Vygotskian Perspectives* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), pp. 183 - 204.

Rossner, R., Selecting teacher educators - establishing criteria, in Duff, T., *Explorations in Teacher Training. Problems and Issues*. (London: Longman, 1988), pp. 101-109.

Schön, D. A., *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (Aldershot: Avebury, 1983).

Schön, D. A., *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action* (Aldershot: Arena, 1991).

Searle, J. R., *Speech Acts. An Essay in the Philosophy of Language* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969).

Shavelson, R. J. and P. Stern, 'Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgements, decisions, and behavior', *Review of Educational Research*, 51, 4 (1981) 455-498.

Sinclair, J. M., Corpus evidence in language description, in Wichmann, A., S. Fligelstone, T. McEnery and G. Knowles, *Teaching and Language Corpora* (New York: Longman, 1997), pp. 27-39.

Swales, J., *Genre Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

Swales, J., *Other Floors, Other Voices: A Textography of a Small University Building*. (Mahwah, New Jersey: Erlbaum., 1998).

Tanner, R. and C. Green, *Tasks for Teacher Education. A Reflective Approach*. (Harlow: Longman, 1998).

Tao, H. and M. McCarthy, 'Understanding non-restrictive *which*-clauses in spoken English, which is not an easy thing', *Language Sciences*, 23, (2001) 651-677.

Tognini-Bonelli, E., *Corpus Linguistics at Work* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2001).

VanPatten, B., 'How language teaching is constructed', *The Modern Language Journal*, 81, i (1997) 1-5.

Vygotsky, L. S., *Mind in Society. The Development of Higher Psychological Processes* (Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1978).

Wajnryb, R., 'Learning to teach - the place of self-evaluation', *TESL Reporter*, 19, 4 (1992) 63-68.

Wallace, M., *Training Foreign Language Teachers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

Wallace, M., *Action Research for Language Teachers* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Wallace, M., Teaching practice: from experience to expertise, in Gollin, J., G. Ferguson, and H. Trappes-Lomax, *Proceedings of Symposium for Language Teacher Educators, Edinburgh, 2000, 2001, 2002*. (Edinburgh: IALS, CD Publication, 2003).

Warford, M. K. and J. Reeves, 'Falling into it: novice TESOL teacher thinking', *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 9, 1 (2003) 47-65.

Wenger, E., *Communities of Practice. Learning, Meaning, and Identity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Wertsch, J. V., *Mind as Action* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

Widdowson, H. G., 'Innovation in teacher development', *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 13, (1993) 260-275.

Wideen, M., J. Mayer-Smith and B. Moon, 'A critical analysis of the research on learning to teach: making the case for an ecological perspective in inquiry', *Review of Educational Research*, 68, 2 (1998) 130-178.

Woodward, T., *Ways of Training* (London: Longman, 1992).

Yule, G., *Pragmatics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996).

## **Appendix 1 - Transcription Symbols in POTTI**

<\$Tr>	Trainer
<\$Tee>	Trainee
<\$E>	Exatralinguistic information
+	Interruption
=	Incomplete word
<\$G2>	Guessed word with 2 syllables
<\$G?>	Guessed word with unknown number of syllables
<\$O>	Overlapped utterance

## Extract 1

1 <\$Tr> +for those students em <\$E> pause five seconds </\$E> now when you wanted them  
2 to do the the instruct= to do this exercise here what did you ask them to do?  
3 <\$Tee> Em 'look at exercise B' <\$E> laughing </\$E> I said 'fill in the gap exercise' I  
4 never told them that the words were in the bottom.  
5 <\$Tr> Yeah.  
6 <\$Tee> The box at the bottom.  
7 <\$Tr> Yeah mmhm.  
8 <\$Tee> And I don't think they understood that until I said 'oh by the way'+  
9 <\$Tr> Yeah.  
10 <\$Tee> +'forgot to tell you there's a box at the bottom with the words in it'.  
11 <\$Tr> Yeah now what other instruction would you need ah?  
12 <\$Tee> I should have told them that there were four words that wouldn't have been used  
13 that would not necessarily fit into the.  
14 <\$Tr> Do you need to tell them that they are four?  
15 <\$Tee> Maybe some words just.  
16 <\$Tr> Y= y= you see you want them what you're trying to do is get them to work a bit  
17 harder so+  
18 <\$Tee> Right.  
19 <\$Tr> +maybe there are a few words or there are some words that are not in that aren't  
20 relevant or that you don't have to.  
21 <\$Tee> Put in yeah.  
22 <\$Tr> Put in.  
23 <\$Tee> And I should have told them that th= with some of them that you can have different  
24 different <\$G2> mind you that was there anyway starter advertiser.  
25 <\$Tr> Well you see they can't have different words because this is the only one+  
26 <\$Tee> Right.  
27 <\$Tr> +because they have to choose from a a limited+  
28 <\$Tee> Oh but I mean and to start <\$G?>.  
29 <\$Tr> +number yeah.  
30 <\$Tee> Either would do.  
31 <\$Tr> Oh well they would they know that+  
32 <\$Tee> Yeah.  
33 <\$Tr> +that's quite clear from the the slash between them so I wouldn't explain that but you  
34 do need to explain that they are to choose from this and that+  
35 <\$Tee> Mmhm.  
36 <\$Tr> +everything is not+  
37 <\$Tee> Instructions.  
38 <\$Tr> +and that they can only use each word once so that's awful because if you ta= there  
39 are other exercises not here where there's here I think there's only one definite word for  
40 each space+  
41 <\$Tee> Mmhm.  
42 <\$Tr> +but sometimes in gap you'd need to look at gap fill exercises and see can one  
43 word+  
44 <\$Tee> Fit into two places+  
45 <\$Tr> +go into two places.  
46 <\$Tee> Yeah.

47 <\$Tr> So you have to look at the whole thing and see yeah that if I put it up here then I  
48 really need it for down+  
49 <\$Tee> Yeah.  
50 <\$Tr> +here.  
51 <\$Tee> Mmhm.  
52 <\$Tr> So they have to your instructions need to carry this sort of information if it's relevant  
53 so you need the instructions need to be ah a lot clearer.



## Extract 2

1 <\$Tr> ... now one area that I want you to try a difficult area to work on+  
2 <\$Tee> My voice is it? I noticed.  
3 <\$Tr> The sounds you know the pronunciation of the T H sounds+  
4 <\$Tee> Mmhm.  
5 <\$Tr> +ah don't don't do you ever use them correctly? You're from Cork are you?  
6 <\$Tee> Killarney.  
7 <\$Tr> Killarney.  
8  
9 (five turns later)  
10  
11 <\$Tr> The the T H you because we do dental most Irish speaker= I mean all of us would do  
12 dental Ts where it should be+  
13 <\$Tee> Mm.  
14 <\$Tr> +and we don't+  
15 <\$Tee> Right mmhm.  
16 <\$Tr> +but if you're teaching on a at an international level if you're teaching it is a sound  
17 that you need to actually have.  
18 <\$Tee> Mmhm.  
19 <\$Tr> The th= you know that at least you're aware that this is if you're giving specific  
20 classes that this is how you+  
21 <\$Tee> Yeah.  
22 <\$Tr> +this is how they ah this should be pronounced and there was one other sound that  
23 I+  
24  
25 (five turns later)  
26  
27 <\$Tr> Now this word is 'aw' boil right whereas you pronounce it 'bile' 'bile'+  
28 <\$Tee> Right.  
29 <\$Tr> +now if you pronounce it 'bile' I+  
30 <\$Tee> Like B I L E.  
31 <\$Tr> +you're prono= yeah+  
32 <\$Tee> Mmhm.  
33 <\$Tr> Now they because when it comes to teaching pronunciation later on and if you take  
34 the words.  
35 <\$Tee> Pen and pin <\$E> reading </\$E>.  
36  
37 (six turns later)  
38  
39 <\$Tr> You mightn't no Cork Cork Cork speakers do you know they tend to say 'hand me  
40 the pin'+  
41 <\$Tee> Oh right.  
42 <\$Tr> +an they're talking about this+  
43 <\$Tee> Mmhm.  
44 <\$Tr> +which is a pen but it's just be aware of it.  
45 <\$Tee> Okay.

### Extract 3

1 <\$Tr> ... the one area that I want to talk to you about Joanna is because I say the content of  
2 the lesson wasn't what I focussed in on yesterday at all wh= what I focussed in on yesterday  
3 was your approach to the students themselves now wh= what sort of a person do you  
4 consider yourself in terms of are you+  
5 <\$Tee> A teacher.  
6 <\$Tr> +are you a friendly person or are you an aloof person or+  
7 <\$Tee> Oh no I'm friendly and+  
8 <\$Tr> Mmhm+  
9 <\$Tee> +I try and get on listening to them.  
10 <\$Tr> Now you see I didn't get any of this I my only meeting with you has been in TP+  
11 <\$Tee> Mmhm mmhm.  
12 <\$Tr> +sessions when you're very friendly and you contribute and you make very sensible  
13 contributions and things like that and yesterday when I went into the classroom I found  
14 somebody who was like I suppose the best thing is like an old style muinteoir+  
15 <\$Tee> Me?  
16 <\$Tr> Yes.  
17 <\$Tee> Okay.  
18 <\$Tr> Now th= please don't take this+  
19 <\$Tee> Oh no <\$OTee> that's fine that's okay </\$OTee>.  
20 <\$Tr> <\$OTee> This is what came </\$OTee> across to me now you started by when you  
21 looked at the video how many times did you ask them to keep quiet?  
22 <\$Tee> Three or four.  
23 <\$Tr> You asked them about six+  
24 <\$Tee> Did I? Right.

#### Extract 4

1 <\$Tr> ...I was sorry for having interrupted you because+  
2 <\$Tee> Oh no.  
3 <\$Tr> +I that just made you more nervous.  
4 <\$Tee> I couldn't hear you with the the class was so big and I couldn't hear what you were  
5 saying and+  
6 <\$Tr> Yeah.  
7 <\$Tee> +oh God I didn't know what you meant so.  
8 <\$Tr> Yeah.  
9 <\$Tee> I'm sorry for not arranging them the way you <\$G3> I didn't have a clue what you  
10 were saying <\$E> laughing </\$E>.  
11 <\$Tr> No no no that that's okay em so wh= you ha= you've had a look at the video.

### Extract 5

1       <\$Tee> ....I got rattled again and now I am kind of shaking when they ask me a question  
2       I'm going no <\$E>laughing<\\$E> so I'm not in the best of form with confidence of them  
3       asking me+  
4       <\$Tr> No I thought you were very confident in the classroom I thought your personality  
5       came across very nicely in the classroom and you struck me as being somebody who was  
6       confident+  
7       <\$Tee> Yeah  
8       <\$Tr> +in the classroom.  
9       <\$Tee> Yeah that is what I wanted well I don't tend to feel as nervous but when they ask  
10      me to explain something it's like 'oh my god no' like and my mind goes blank....

<b>WORD</b>	<b>OCCURRENCES</b>
good	139
nice	41
interesting	34
very well	27
best	14
pleased	10
great	6
effective	4
excellent	4

Table 1 Validating words in POTTI

<b>Feedback session</b>	<b>Trainer</b>	<b>Trainee</b>	<b>Trainer words</b>	<b>Trainee words</b>	<b>Total words</b>	<b>% Trainer talk</b>	<b>% Trainee talk</b>
1	Edwina	Lorna	1,879	954	2,833	66.33	33.67
2	Fionnuala	Roseanna	3,447	1,798	5,245	65.72	34.28
3	Fionnuala	Jim	4,748	4,552	9,300	51.06	48.94
4	Edwina	Petra	2,726	1,808	4,534	60.12	39.88
5	Fionnuala	Peter	5,050	2,173	7,223	69.92	30.08
6	Edwina	Michael	4,462	3,884	8,346	53.46	46.54
7	Fionnuala	Joanne	3,492	1,951	5,443	64.16	35.84
8	Edwina	Jim	5,365	3,281	8,646	62.05	37.95
9	Edwina	Roseanna	4,422	1,829	6,251	70.74	29.26
10	Edwina	Joanne	3,082	1,619	4,701	65.56	34.44
11	Fionnuala	Lorna	2,930	1,143	4,073	71.94	28.06
12	Fionnuala	Michael	2,408	1,332	3,740	64.39	35.61
13	Fionnuala	Petra	4,035	2,352	6,387	63.18	36.82
14	Edwina	Peter	4,045	1,177	5,222	77.46	22.54
<b>Total</b>			<b>52,091</b>	<b>29,853</b>	<b>81,944</b>	<b>63.57</b>	<b>36.43</b>

Table 2 Speaker participation in POTTI

<b>Feedback session</b>	<b>Trainer</b>	<b>Trainee</b>	<b>Trainer utterance length (mean)</b>	<b>Trainee utterance length (mean)</b>
1	Edwina	Lorna	23.49	12.08
2	Fionnuala	Roseanna	13.57	6.75
3	Fionnuala	Jim	15.52	15.22
4	Edwina	Petra	13.56	9.48
5	Fionnuala	Peter	22.48	8.48
6	Edwina	Michael	13.24	11.59
7	Fionnuala	Joanne	13.86	7.76
8	Edwina	Jim	19.28	11.97
9	Edwina	Roseanna	21.06	8.88
10	Edwina	Joanne	23.71	12.74
11	Fionnuala	Lorna	25.93	10.16
12	Fionnuala	Michael	16.49	9.79
13	Fionnuala	Petra	19.13	11.70
14	Edwina	Peter	27.52	8.17

Table 3 Utterance length by participant in POTTI